
SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - JULY 17, 2000

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE July 17, 2000

ATTENDEES
See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION
Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Next Meeting: Monday, August 7, 2000 – 1-3 p.m.
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on **July 17, 2000**, in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

INTEGRATED PROJECT SCHEDULE UPDATE (provided at meeting) (Michael Graham)

We have provided an overall schedule update so that people can see where we are on the project. We had our National Academy of Sciences (NAS) meeting in June. We also had a management review of the System Assessment Capability (SAC).

Does anyone have any questions?

QUESTION: On the schedule, I notice that the Level One Logic has been deferred. What level of detail is Level One?

We have a system engineering effort to look at the relationships between SAC and Science and Technology (S&T) and map that into the level of planning. We are going to drive that down to detailed planning.

QUESTION: When will that be ready?

The Level One Logic was deferred until next fiscal year. There will be a public review August 17, 2000, of the detailed work plan (DWP).

RPP Assessments (Fred Mann)

We are continuing the slant borehole drilling and sampling at SX-108. As of Friday, the tenth sample has been taken. The last six samples have been from underneath the tank. We are well underneath the tank. We lost sample #2. Samples #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7 were very hot. Samples #9 and #10 show basically no gamma radiation.

QUESTION: What were the depths with those samples?

Depths were 55, 68, 73, 77, 82, 85 and 90 feet. At that point, we don't see any gamma radiation. There could be contaminants there, but we don't know as yet. As of this morning, we are ready to take the 11th sample. Every five feet, we get another sample until we reach about 130 feet. Then, we will take a sample every ten feet. We will stop at the Ringold layer.

QUESTION: How far above water level is that?

About 60 feet.

We lost sample #2 and the other samples are in the lab. We hope to finish the actual sampling in the next two to three weeks. We should have all the samples and be finished with the geophysical logging by the next meeting.

S&T Update (Mark Freshley)

We had the second meeting with the NAS Committee in June. We covered the end-state vision for the Hanford site and the decisions that need to be made to achieve that vision. We went through our S&T plan and roadmap, covering various decisions and how to support those decisions. The field trip we planned for Thursday was cancelled due to the fire. So, we held breakout sessions instead. The Committee had a closed session Thursday morning, and the breakout sessions were held Thursday afternoon.

The next meeting will be September 6 – 8, 2000. We will try to do the field trip during that meeting. There is another session scheduled for early November. However, Kevin Crowley thought we might not be required to attend that meeting. They will be having a series of closed sessions and will prepare a report at the end of the study.

QUESTION: Is the September meeting here or elsewhere?

The September meeting will be held here. The November meeting is also scheduled to be here, but that is subject to change. They have facilities in Washington, D.C. and on the west coast to do their writing.

QUESTION: Have you or will you receive any feedback from them as to what your weak points or strong points are?

During the sessions, we get an indication of some of the points that the members of the committees will raise in their report.

QUESTION: Do you foresee good results? Do you get any feeling of their response?

I would not be surprised to hear that the committee feels there needs to be a stronger emphasis on S&T. A good reference is the last booklet they prepared. They looked at cleanup issues across the complex. It's a really good reference.

They started getting into some of the technical issues during the breakout sessions this time. I believe we'll get some feedback on a technical level. They may have some opinions but they are holding them pretty tightly at this point.

System Assessment Capability (Bob Bryce)

There was a management review of SAC involving Dr. Ed Berkey, Mel Marietta, Jim Karr and Mike Kavanaugh. We asked them to look at whether or not SAC Rev. 0 would meet the overall objectives stated in past discussions about that capability. Also, we wanted them to identify any modifications needed to meet those objectives. Such as, key improvements needed to Rev. 1. They formulated what a management review should entail. Where are we going and why? What approach should be used? Is the schedule appropriate? They gave us a lot of feedback. They felt SAC is making progress in that the plan is becoming clearer. They feel the plan is sound. They did recommend that we develop a much more detailed success criteria. Periodic reviews would be very useful as well. Mel Marietta and Bob Hammer did a design document review in March.

We need to look at what we are going to do with this advice. We may want to set up a standing committee for review as SAC goes on. This will give us a technical overview. There needs to be a review on history matching when that is complete, and then again at the completion of the initial assessment. I thought that was a good point.

QUESTION: What might the success criteria look like?

We have struggled with that a lot. We plan to sit down and think about that a lot before the end of this fiscal year. We will consider questions about how well the predictions match what we've seen through history and how good we expect those matches to be. There is a lot of modeling and field activity. We need to consider what direction we need to go to really improve what we're doing. We've got to look at how the results of these experiments help us in modeling. The S&T team will be performing some of the modeling.

QUESTION: Is the Rev. 0 analysis probabalistic?

Yes.

COMMENT: My feeling on Rev. 0 is that it can provide all sorts of insights on all kinds of things. We did a good job of articulating the results and how we will use them. What was difficult and what we needed to do more on was how would the limitations be articulated so that we might get appropriate external use – external to SAC. We need to be careful about how we might use Rev. 0 results.

COMMENT: It would seem that if the results themselves revealed any glaring red lights, you would certainly know where to go with those kinds of things.

May Congressional Report (Michael Graham)

The Semi-Annual report is releasable. It's been delivered by U. S. Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) to the Congressional offices. It has been posted on the Integration Project website. We would appreciate any feedback. The report is a little different this time. Often times, we get caught up in our technical presentations and people that don't live with us can't understand what we're talking about. We tried to make the report a little less technical so that others could understand it better. A technical writer by the name of Robert Katt helped us on it. We are very impressed with his ability to work with us and explain to others what we are doing. He's under contract and will continue to help us.

Upcoming Events (Michael Graham)

Looking at the calendar, Mike Thompson, Steve Sauter, and I (Michael Graham) will be taking the document to Oregon. Then, in two weeks, we'll have another Open Project Meeting. Following that, there will be three days of peer review on the Detailed Work Plan (DWP). The schedule for that will be out by August 7, 2000. That review will cover Groundwater management, monitoring, pump and treat, S&T, SAC – the whole thing. We have another NAS review scheduled for September 6 – 8, 2000. The Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) is meeting October 25 – 27, 2000.

QUESTION: If the NAS feedback has to be inferred from questions they ask, what questions did they ask regarding risk?

I didn't have the opportunity to sit in on that session. I think at this point they are just getting introduced to risk and the things we are proposing. It's difficult to tell where they are headed because they are still collecting information. They did ask a question concerning what would happen if we had another glacial flood. They spent a lot of time trying to understand where Hanford is headed. They also want to better understand how Research & Development (R & D) decisions are made. They are just trying to get an understanding. One positive aspect, from our standpoint, is that we are communicating clearly so that they can understand it. They are appreciative of that. It's good to know that we are communicating effectively.

COMMENT: Sounds like they have several good credentials in risk assessment.

Yes, they do.

QUESTION: What's the process for getting information to this panel?

Go to their website. They are accepting feedback in writing.

QUESTION: How about getting documents to them?

On the website, they have contact names for you. If you have any difficulty on that, we can help you out. You can get to their site through our site, there is a link. If you go to the NAS homepage, it can be confusing getting to this particular study. It's much easier to get to through our site. The link is located in the Peer/Technical Review section.

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting went well.

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669) or Alison Kent (509-372-9192).

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky – Tri-Cities Caucus

Bob Bryce – PNNL

Shelley Cimon - HAB

Mark Freshley – PNNL

Michael Graham – BHI

Dib Goswami – Ecology

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ

Andy Hayes – BHI

Gary Jewell – BHI

Alison Kent – BHI

Tony Knepp – CHG

Katy Makeig – SMS

Fred Mann – FFS

Buck Sisson - INEEL

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
JULY 20, 2000 – OCTOBER 31, 2000
THREE MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

July 20	Oregon Office of Energy and Oregon Public Interest Groups State Office Building (Portland, OR) (Contact: Steve Sautter)
August 7	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
August 15-17	Review ERC DWP with RL/BHI Management, Regulators, and DOE-HQ
August 21	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
September 4	CANCELLED DUE TO HOLIDAY: GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
September 6-7	Tentative NAS Meeting (Richland, WA)
September 7-8	HAB Meeting (Seattle)
September 12	HAB Environmental Restoration Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.
September 18	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
October 2	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
October 10	HAB Environmental Restoration Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.
October 16	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Dru Butler)
October 23-24	Oregon-Hanford Waste Board Hood River, OR
October 25-27	Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting BHI Assembly Room